



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sæm, Here, too, may we place the word *amæn*,

In the Vulgate these names appear with an *e* which represents, sometimes Gr. *ν*, sometimes Gr. *ς*. From *Jafæth* (6807) added to the forms *Asæres*, *Jssræless*, *Josæpess*, *Moyssæsess*, *Nazaræess* we may assume a long *ē*. The author of the 'Heliand' writes most of these names with *ê* (but *Nazareth*). Orm writes *Nicodem*, never **Nicodæm*. The matter is not of great importance since the names are, of course, learned words.

Æ also appears in a number of words of which the origin seems to me obscure: *ægæde*, *anndgætenn*, *anndgætnesse*, *bæwenn*, *onndlêtt*, *slætenn*, *wælinng*.

Such being the material, all interested in the matter will be best able to draw their own conclusions. It will be proper, however, to note briefly what seems most evident.

1. The sign *æ* is always long. Aside from the examples above, it is to be remarked, first, that it never appears with the sign for shortness and, second, very rarely with the sign for length; if it were necessary to make a difference between *ê* and *é* we should expect to find *æ* with mark for length and for shortness as often as the other vowels. It is further to be remarked that *æ* almost always, in the middle of a syllable, stands before a single consonant (and even before a double consonant it might be long, *ûtterrlîke*, 16510, *onndlêtt*, 16170). And here I must remark that in *æddmod* and *unnc lænnleꝯꝯc* that *æ* is probably long and not with Brate (*Beiträge*, x, 11) short. If all the examples of *æddmod* are collected will be seen that there is variance in the writing and *æddmod* is the more common from: *unnc lænnleꝯꝯc* is an error of the Glossary; the text gives one *u* 4628 (cf. 2523, 2539, 4622). There are certain words in which *æ* is the representation of OE. *æ* in which we have no especial ground for assuming lengthening. *bæd*, *forrbæd*, may have arisen from analogy with the plurals. But in *æbær*, *græfes* and *æpel*, it would not be so easy to say why lengthening should appear; or if the vowels were long why they should not be *á*.

2. *æ* is to be taken regularly as open *ê* (2ê) since it represents OE. *ea* which was surely open and never OE. *éo*.

In regard to quantitative changes in phonology there is not much to add to Brate and Effer.

3. Lengthening before *rn*, *rd* must have appeared before the change *ea* > *a*; *ærn*, *bærn*, *bærnennde*; *ærd*, *middilærd*, *kirkægærd*, *feærd*, and not **arn*, etc. As to lengthening before *ld*, the matter is not sufficiently indicated; we have *Alhwældennd*, but *walde*, *Elldernemannes* and *alde* with compounds. These exceptions I take to be W.S. loanwords. The regular Mercian form would be with *a* as is the rule in R'.

4. In like manner the shortening in *lassten*, *tahhte*, *ahhte*, *shadd*, must have taken place before *ea* > *æ*, and before *ea* > *a*. Otherwise, we should have *lesssten*, etc.

5. Later than these changes, however, is the shortening in *errnde*, *sellpe*, *ehhte*, *eꝯꝯper*, *wepmann*, *clennlike*, *clennscnn*.

As to quality it is to be remarked.

6. OE. *êa* before palatals had become *êê*.

7. W.S. *é* (W.S. *ai* with *i*-umlaut, and W.S. *á*) appears mostly as *2ê*, before dentals often *êê*. The general course from the close sound to the open in Ps, R', and O. has been already noted.

On minor matters.

8. *eo* seems to have been by this time merely an historical sign indicating for this dialect nothing different from *e*.

9. It appears that *ē* in proper names was open. But here the usage of Orm is not borne out in other examples, for instance, Gen. and Ex. where there is much variation.

10. *éo* and *eo* after palatals have lost all character as diphthongs.

EDWARD E. HALE, JR.

State University of Iowa.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

The Literature of France. By H. G. KEENE, HON. M. A. OXON. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York: 1892, pp. vii. 219.

THIS volume belongs to a series entitled 'University Extension Manuals,' edited by Professor Wm. Knight. The series is to be issued simultaneously in England (by John Murray) and in America. It is the outgrowth of the University Extension movement in

England, and is designed to supplement that movement. It aims to reach the general reader, living apart from the centres of the movement, and to furnish him with the same kind of information as is given in lectures.

In the present Manual (following the general plan of the series) details are avoided, except as they show the working out of laws and principles. The aim being to educate rather than to inform, the author has attempted to guide the student or reader

"through the consecutive evolution of French literary history, from the beginning of the nation to a time immediately preceding our own."

Living authors are excluded from the survey. The author wishes to give a correct general view, so that his reader may form an idea of the literature of France as a whole, with the reciprocal relations of its various schools and stages of development.

Chronological division and treatment is abandoned, and in its stead the object has been to treat the subject logically by dividing it into five Ages: The Age of Infancy, The Age of Adolescence (Sixteenth Century), The Age of Glory, The Age of Reason and The Age of Nature. The last two chapters of the book discuss the sources of French prose fiction and poetry of the present time. An Introduction of eight pages is devoted to a somewhat technical discussion of the scope and application of literature.

The volume, thus put together, seems bright and original, and forms very interesting reading, especially for the reader who may be presumed to have already some general knowledge of the subject. The author has an entertaining style and shows a thorough familiarity with his theme. His own interesting narrative is appropriately set off by numerous short quotations from the literature, among which, along side of oft-repeated lines like the 'Mignonne! allons voir si la rose,' appear many illustrative passages (especially in prose) which are more novel and not less opportune. In his estimation of past writers, Mr. Keene says he has refrained from obtruding his own opinions. This is perhaps rather difficult to do in any case. In the present one an air of entire impersonality does not appear to be

preserved throughout. Certainly the author's admiration for Racine is most generous. About fifteen pages are devoted to him in a volume of some two hundred. A few other writers of perhaps equal eminence seem to suffer in comparison. An enthusiastic admirer of Molière would wish to see a fuller treatment of his works; about one page is allotted to him. Some space being used to show how far Victor Hugo in his drama has proved himself the descendant of the past, Racine naturally assumes a prominent position; still, for the author, "Racine is the only one who, in his best work, is quite *perfect*." Among the precursors of the Romantic movement Chateaubriand is given a deservedly prominent place; Mme. de Staël's influence seems understated. A very just and well-worded characterization of the realistic novelists is given in the concluding pages of the volume.

There is little occasion in such a work for allusion to etymologies, but on p. 13, *oui* is referred to *hoc illud*. On the same page a misprint occurs in *Roman du Rou*, and, a quotation from the first part of this epic being given, the lines are stated to be the earliest attempt at the Alexandrine metre.

As a manual for the work of University Extension, the book may appear (at least if one judge it from the standpoint of the movement in America) to lack symmetry, and to be a trifle too erudite for the purpose. While being somewhat unequal in treatment, it impresses one as hardly categorical enough for the uninitiated.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

SPANISH DIALECT.

Tesoro de voces y Provincialismos Hispano-Americanos. Publicado por CARLOS LENTZNER. Tomo i; Parte primera. La Region del Rio de la Plata. Halle a. S.—Leipzig: Eberhardt Karras, Editor. 1892. xvii, 63 pp. (A-C.). Preis, 3 Mark.

WHILE the French and Italian dialects have in late years received a great deal of attention from scholars, and not a year passes without additions to the stock of knowledge concerning them, the Spanish dialects seem to have